

next meet for legislative business on Tuesday, October 30, at 12:30 for morning hour and at 2 o'clock p.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow.

On Tuesday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 o'clock p.m.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures subject to rules:

The conference report to accompany H.R. 2590, the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002, which should be filed at some point tomorrow and be ready for consideration in the House on Wednesday;

H.R. 3150, the bill of the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) to improve aviation security; and

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2002, which was marked up in full committee yesterday.

Appropriators are also continuing to work on several conference reports. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) reports that he is hopeful that the Energy and Water, VA-HUD, and Legislative Branch appropriations conference reports may all be ready for consideration in the House at some point next week. I will be happy to schedule them for consideration on the floor as soon as they become available.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire from my friend, the gentleman from Texas, is he still bringing fast track legislation to the floor, and if so, when?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, the fast track trade promotion authority legislation is, of course, a high priority of the administration and of many Members; to, I hope, most of the Members of this body.

It is not scheduled for next week. It is something we would like to schedule, but I do not see at this time any announcement that could be made on that legislation.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, what day does he expect the aviation security bill to come to the floor? Are we going to be able to offer our substitute under the proposed rule?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman again for his inquiry.

If he will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, we will consider the aviation bill on Wednesday. If I might mention, we also are aware that Wednesday is an important day in the family life of many of our Members, and we will try to complete our work in time for the Members to have time with their families on Wednesday evening, which is a time of great joy for the children.

Mr. BONIOR. I will remind my friend, the gentleman from Texas, and he may

have already thought of this, but of course, we are changing clocks. We are falling behind an hour I believe it is Sunday, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for the reminder. I certainly would have been caught napping. I appreciate that.

If the gentleman would continue to yield, on the other part of the question, obviously the Committee on Rules has not yet met on that bill.

I can say to the gentleman that I will be personally recommending that the rule include a substitute, and then of course a motion to recommit in consideration of that airline security bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, the ranking member of the committee that deals with the support legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to reinforce that on our side we would hope to be able to offer a substitute developed within our committee. We came very close to reaching agreement with the majority on our committee on one of the central issues of aviation security, how screening shall be provided at domestic airports. I think that is a pivotal difference.

We would want to be sure that the rule would, in all fairness, give us the opportunity to offer our proposal as a substitute. Mr. Speaker, could the distinguished majority leader assure us that the Committee on Rules would make such a provision or substitute in order?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) will continue to yield, let me just say that obviously the Committee on Rules will act on this, and I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota and others will make our recommendations to the Committee on Rules.

I can only tell the gentleman at this time that I will be recommending that a substitute be made in order.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague, and I wish him a good weekend.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2001

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2001

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns on Monday, October 29, 2001, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 30, 2001, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE WAR ON TERRORISM AND THE FUTURE OF AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the war on terrorism continues; at home we deal with a chemical and biological attack, something that is unprecedented in our history; and overseas, our military forces are striking their targets in Afghanistan and they are involved in special operations in that country. This is a war on terrorism. This is a war in the truest sense of the word.

But what is important for us at home now to fully understand is that before we can win the war, we must be able to define what victory means. That definition is as important now as is our efforts to win the war physically and militarily.

Security at home is certainly an important goal that will mean victory or defeat. If we are not secure at home at the end of this conflict, there will have been no victory. Certainly we understand that: security and freedom for the United States of America.

Number two, the war on terrorism as outlined by the President sets some very majestic and very admirable goals, goals that we should not forget. And as we pursue victory in this war, let us remember that, from this podium, the President has set these goals that we should achieve before we can claim victory has been achieved.

One of those goals is setting a new definition for terrorism. Perhaps under

George W. Bush, we will be at long last able to establish a definition of terrorism and unite the world behind the concept that it is no longer acceptable to target noncombatants in any type of conflict.

So whether they are Palestinians blowing up noncombatants in front of a Pizza Hut, or whether it is Israeli troops involved with some sort of retaliation against unarmed civilians for an attack that they have suffered, or whether it is a bomb going off anywhere that kills unarmed people, or people who shoot unarmed people and kill them to achieve any end, that will no longer be acceptable in the civilized world. This is a laudable goal and a long-term goal.

But before we can have peace, before we can have victory in this war on terrorism, there is at least one interim goal we must achieve; that is, peace in Afghanistan.

Afghanistan for these last 20 years and the people of Afghanistan have lived under terror and repression and bloodshed in which so many of their noncombatants have been targeted. We must bring peace to the people of Afghanistan.

Unfortunately, that country has been the target of so many of the other countries around it who wanted to dominate Afghanistan. This itself has led to the conflicts in Afghanistan, and the horrible price that we eventually had to pay for ignoring that ongoing tragedy in Afghanistan.

Today I would submit that the King of Afghanistan, who has been exiled since the 1970s from that country, offers us the best hope, the only hope, of ending that ongoing tragedy.

□ 1315

There are many forces trying to offer other solutions. But if you look right below, as far as the other solutions, they are nothing more than the countries around Afghanistan trying to dominate through a strong individual or a puppet the people of Afghanistan.

The King of Afghanistan is the most beloved person in his country. The people love him. For years and years they have seen his rule, which lasted for 4 decades, as a time of peace and prosperity. They know that he will watch out for their benefit and is not someone who will be dominated by the Pakistanis or the Uzbeks or the Tajiks or any other group, but instead will look out for the people of Afghanistan.

He has pledged to head a transition government that will only be in place for a few years while a democratic process is instituted so the people of Afghanistan can determine their own destiny and that must be our goal: peace in Afghanistan, and the people of that country being permitted to control their own destiny through the electoral process. This is what will bring peace to the world. And I would

ask our State Department to side with this strategy rather than being manipulated by other governments, like Pakistan, who are trying to still, in some way, dominate that country of Afghanistan.

WORKING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, this country is on a wartime footing, and I think we should be on a wartime schedule in this House of Representatives. The reason I say that is it is 1:15 in the afternoon. This House has completed its work for the day. The American people know that we left Washington last Wednesday evening. We did not return to Washington for session until 6 p.m. this Tuesday. Yesterday we went in to session at 10 o'clock in the morning. We finished at about 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon. Today we went in session at 10 o'clock. It is now only 1:15 in the afternoon, and we have finished for the week and will not return to this Chamber to our work until 6 o'clock next Tuesday.

The reason I think that is unacceptable is the fact that we have yet to deal with the airline security legislation. And every day that passes, American citizens who get on our airlines, do so without being as fully protected as they ought to be.

I have here today an editorial from the Columbus Dispatch, the major newspaper in Columbus, Ohio, which is the capital city of our State. It was written on October 16. The editorial says in part: "Since terrorists blew up Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, in 1988, many Americans have assumed that their checked baggage was being X-rayed. After all, without such a check, how could anyone be certain that a bomb hadn't been stowed in the cargo hold?"

As Americans know now, travellers who believe that baggage was routinely X-rayed were enjoying a false sense of security."

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know that when they buy a ticket and get on a passenger plane in this country today, that it is likely that 95 percent of the luggage that is placed into the belly of that airline has not been screened for explosive devices. Think about that. We are being urged to go back to life in a normal way. We are being urged to use the airlines, to travel by air, to fly.

But the American people have a right to know that today this Congress has yet to take action, this House has yet to take action on a bill to provide them airline security and, especially, to require that all the baggage that is

placed in the airplanes that we fly on, that baggage is checked for explosives.

Now, it really puzzles me why the House has not acted. This is something the American people absolutely want to have done. The Senate more than 2 weeks ago voted 100 to nothing, every Senator of both political parties voted to pass this airline security legislation which would require the 100 percent check of all the luggage that is placed on our airlines. And yet day after day has passed, week after week has passed; and the leadership in this House has refused to even allow that legislation be brought to this floor for debate and a vote. It is unconscionable and the American people have a right to be outraged.

I would like to share some other comments from this editorial written by the Columbus Dispatch on October 16: "Will there be no end to the revelations of how poorly the Federal Government, airport security workers and airlines have handled the job of protecting passengers? How many other rules aren't being enforced? How much evidence do House Republicans need to convince them that only a top notch security force, paid by the taxpayers and not hired by the low-bid contractors, will make the airways as safe as possible?"

"A bill passed by the Senate and pending in the House would federalize airport security. The House should stop playing politics with this essential legislation and pass it."

Those are the words of the Columbus Dispatch.

Many people are shocked to learn that here in the Washington area at the Dulles International Airport, 80 percent or more than 80 percent of the people who are responsible for screening our bags for explosive devices and making sure that weapons are not taken aboard our airlines, 80 percent or more are noncitizens. How can we do background checks on individuals who are noncitizens?

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that deserves immediate attention on the part of this House. It is absolutely wrong that on Thursday afternoon at 1:20 in the afternoon we would discharge this House until 6 o'clock next week on Tuesday. It is wrong. The American people will not tolerate this continued delay, because their very lives are at stake.

NO GO FOR QATAR ROUND OF WTO TALKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, we have another bit of evidence on why free trade does not bring freedom.

The oil monarchy of Qatar wants to host the World Trade Organization